(a) *Tras Jivas* having two sense organs Besides the sense organ of touch they have the sense organ of taste as well They can therefore feel whether anything is sour or sweet, bitter, pungent or astringent Being possessed of Tongue they have also Voice Worms, Shells, Conches are examples of *Jivas* possessing two sense organs

(b) *Tras Jivas Having Three Sense Organs* such as Bugs Ants, White ants etc Besides the sense-organs of touch and taste they have the sense organ of smell as well They can feel good or bad smell

(c) *Tras Jivas Having Four Sense Organs* such as Scorpions Flies Mosquitoes Bees, and Crickets Besides the above three organs they also possess eyes and as such can distinguish the five colours such as Black, Yellow Indigo Red and White

(d) *Tras Jivas Having Five Sense Organs* They possess all the sense organs viz - that of touch, taste smell sight and hearing There are four varieties of these *Jivas* (1) The *Jivas* of the hells, (2) The Gods, (3) Human beings and (4) Infra human beings such as beasts and birds

Jainism preaches *Ahimsa* towards all the six kinds of living beings from the one sensed ones to the five sensed ones It preaches equality of all these beings in the domain of religion and does not distinguish even between the small and invisible ones and the visible rational beings like the [illegible] ones It recognises the sanctity of the lives of all

beings and enjoins complete *Ahimsa* towards all in whatever state of existence they may be Jainism preaches that in spiritual field there is no room for relative value Man may be a rational being possessing all the sense organs but so far as the feelings of pleasure and pain are concerned, it is the same in all beings and as such injury to small beings is as sinful as the injury to rational men A rich man may have millions and the other, a poor a penny Depriving the poor of the penny causes him the same agony as depriving the rich of his millions The difference in the value of the penny and million does not make any difference between the feelings of the two Both hold their possessions as equally valuable So also one being may be quite undeveloped and possessed of only one sense, the other may be more developed and possessed of more than one sense but that is no reason why one should be privileged and the other ignored in the domain of religion Why the killing of one should be discouraged and that of the other condoned ? Jainism teaches that injury is sinful in relation to all and should be avoided as much in the case of the small beings as in the case of the big ones "All beings desire to live Non aspires for death Therefore the sinful killing should always be avoided" A Jeweller may put different values on different kinds of jewels according to their qualities but a religious minded man cannot attach different values to different lives on the basis of their outward development He has to look to the psychology of value of one's own life "To do unto others what one would like others to do unto him'—is the maxim which can be said to be the best indicator of the psychology of others and the determinative factor of behaviour towards others Jainism has preached the love for the feelings of others from time immemorial and have laid gre[illegible]asis to look upon other beings

upon one's own soul and not to wound the feelings of any body in the world

The following verses from the Jain Scriptures illustrate the point profusely

पुढवी जीवा पुढो सत्ता आउ जीवा तहागणी
वाउ जीवा पुढो सत्ता तणरुक्खा सबीयगा

(1) Earth, (2) Water, (3) Fire (4) Air, and (5) Vegetables Grass Trees and Corns all—these are different identities of *Jivas*

अहावरा तसा पाणा एवं छक्काय आहिया
एयावए जीवकाए नावरे कोइ विज्जइ

The above five and the *Tras Jivas* these form the six classes of living beings There is no class of *Jivas* other than these

जे केई तसा पाणा चिट्ठन्ति अदुव थावरा
परियाए अत्थि से अञ्जू जेण ते तस थावरा

There are many *Jivas* which are *Sthavaras* or incapable of moving, there are others capable of moving The categories are determined by the actions one has done The variance is due to the individual karmas

उरालं जगओ जोग विवज्जासं पलेन्तिय
सव्वे अक्कन्त दुक्खाय अओ सव्वे अहिंसिया

A *Trasha Jiva* may be transformed into a *Sthavar* in the next life and also vice versa Whether a *Jiva* is *Trasha* or *Sthavar* it makes no difference All dislike affliction and there for injury to all should be avoided

अज्झत्थ सव्वओ सव्व दिस्स पाणे पियायए
न हणे पाणिणो पाणे भय वेराओ उवरए

All feel their own pleasures and pains individually All love their lives So the lives of *Jivas* should not be interfered with A man should not cause fear to others He should keep himself aloof from all kinds of enemity

Comprehensiveness of Jain Ahimsa

From what has been written above it will be seen that the Jain conception of *Ahimsa* is very comprehensive Jain *Ahimsa* extends not only to human beings but goes beyond and embraces within its orbit not only the beasts birds and insects but also the vegetable and the Earth, Water, Fire and Wind lives *Ahimsa* may be called the basic principle of all religions but it is Jainism alone which can lay claim to have extended its horizen to all creations of the world The principle of the sacredness of all lives has no where been respected with the same magnitude and comprehensiveness of heart as in Jainism

Once *Lord Mahavira* addressed his audience and said "I ask you all, tell me whether you like happiness or pain ? If your answer is that you dislike pain then take it from me that it is also the same with other beings" On other occasion he said "Suppose some body comes to you and asks you to hold in your hands a red hot iron-ball, will you do so ? If you cannot be expected to hold it, how can you expect others to do it ? If you do not like to be harshly treated, how do you think that others like to be so treated ? Look into others as you would look to yourself" He has again said "As you would like to remain unmolested so you should keep all others unmolasted You should not kill any living beings and be kindly disposed to them all"

According to Jainism there are three causations

All actions are done by the instrumentality of mind body and speech The Activities of mind, body and speech are called Yoga in Jainism *Himsa* may be caused by any of the three instruments or by all or by any of them in conjunction with any of the other or others When a man kills some body with the sword he is apparently causing *Himsa* by body The injury caused by physical force is due to the activity of the instrument of body When a man orders the killing of some body he apparently commits *Himsa* by word of mouth The *Himsa* caused by mind though unperceivable may still be very violent in degree and more sinful than the one caused by the other two instruments Various instances of *Himsa* of the Mind are found in Jain Literature which are not only very interesting but also greatly illuminating At one time *Maharaj Srenika* was going in a procession on a visit to *Bhagwan Mahavira* On the way he passed by the side of a great Rishi who was in deep meditation at that time The Rishi was himself a great King before his initiation into monkhood As the procession passed by his side the guards of the Emperor *Srenika* talked between themselves 'see the fun of this Rishi What a coward he is that he has left his empire to his young son and has taken recourse to this silent meditation' Look how his kingdom is being snatched away from the hands of his son by that rival king that has invaded the Kingdom' These words fell in the ears of the Rishi He forgot that he was in meditation as a Sadhu and began to wage mental war with the foes of his son He began to wave y swords and other deadly weapons in the arena of d for the time being he was in a pitched battle as if

he was fighting with actual enemies By this time Srenika reached the *Lord Mahavira* and after paying him humble obeisance asked as to what future life would be obtained by the great Rishi, who was meditating so absorbingly *Lord Mahavira* said "*He would go to the meanest Hell*" Emperor Srenika was quite amazed *Lord Mahavira* satisfied his curiosity by answering that the Rishi was not at all in religious meditation but was deeply engrossed in a fierce battle in his mind This explains what is mental *Himsa* What is done by contemplation and mental manoeuvre is *Himsa* done by the instrument of mind Jainism lays great emphasis on avoidance of all kinds of *Himsa* by mind, word and body or the combination of any two or more of them

Actions are executed in three ways either by doing, or by getting done, or by supporting When a person commits *Himsa* himself he performs it is the first way When a person engages others to do some act of injury he commits it in the second way and when a person eulogises the injurious acts of others he commits it in the third way *Himsa* may be caused by any one of these ways or by combination of two or more of them Jainism enjoins the avoidance of *Himsa* in all its ways and by all means Jainism preaches that the activities of the mind, body and speech in all these three ways are to be so controlled and restrained that no injury is caused to any living being It is interesting to note that by combination and permutation of the three means and three ways of activities a total number of 49 kinds of activities are arrived at Jainism enjoins non injury in all the 49 ways In this connection the ordination of *Lord Mahavira*, the great votary of *Ahimsa* is as follows —

जगनिस्सिएहिं भूएहिं तसनामेहिं थावरेहिं च
नो तेसिमारभे दंड मणसा वयसा कायसा चेव

Whatever living beings there are in the world, whether of the moving or non moving class, should not be hurt in any of the ways viz mind, speech or body

जावन्ति लोए पाणा तसा अदुवा थावरा
ते जाणमजाण वा न हणे नो वि घायए

A person aspiring to attain liberation should not consciously or unconsciously kill any living being or cause others to kill them or eulogise killing by others

सय तिवायए पाणे अदुवअ नेहिं घायए
हणन्त वाऽणुजाणाइ वेर वड्ढइ अप्पणो

He who kills lives himself or causes another to kill or supports one who is killing, is simply gathering enmity towards himself

Jainism enjoins *Ahimsa* not only towords friendly beings but towards all beings whether friendly or enemical समया सव्व भूएसु सत्तु मित्तेसु वा जगे ' It says the true principle of *Ahimsa* is to maintain a feeling of equanimity towards all beings whether friends or enemies

Jainism goes on further and says that *Ahimsa* should be maintained in all circumstances and at all places *Ahimsa* is not a virtue of convenience but it is a principle As a principle it should be hold sacred in all circumstances and uphold against all odds A true votary of *Ahimsa* should not grudge any sacrifice and should always think that nothing death can happen

"Tolerate living beings Do not kill them, though they eat your flesh and blood"—such is the teaching of *Lord Mohavira* Though weakened and emaciated by hunger like the joint of a crow's leg, though overwhelmed with thirst in deserts, though trembling with severe cold and though confronted by scorching heat, a true votary of *Ahimsa* should not be vanquished and abstain from killing the vegetable, water, fire, earth and wind lives though his very existance be at stake

Thus it will be seen that *Ahimsa* as followed by the Jains in very comprehensive and all embracing It is a sort of proclamation of fearlessness to the entire creation of beings It is a bond of indemnity agaist all mal-treatment from one-self It is a message of forgiveness and tolerance even to the deadly enemies It is as spacious as the sky itself and as deep as the ocean It is towards all, in all circumstances It is as towards the ant, as towards the elephant and as towards the enemy, as towards the friend

Jainism further teaches "Treat the entire creation, be small or big, on all sides, like thy soul" "Be friendly towards all beings" 'Avoid enmity towards all' "Be ferbearing in your behaviour towards all" "All beings covet life and it is dear to all None like death, all dread it All beings desire happiness and abhor and dread pain Thinking thus do not kill any living being" Thus Jain *Ahimsa* is a principle of universal love and fellow-feeling It is brotherhood not only of man and man but *men with beasts, birds, insects and whatever* is embodied with life and consciousness This principle of *Ahimsa* is being preached by Jainism from time immemorial *Lord Rishav*, the First *Tirthankar* of the present Era. who has been [illegible] a great Avatar and Avadhut

Holy *Righ Veda* preached this very thing to his 98 sons aspiring for kingdom and converted them all into great Saints of *Ahimsa* The 22nd *Tirthankar* of the Jains, the venerable *Lord Neminath* on account of his deep regard for this very principle of *Ahimsa* gave up his proposed marriage with *Rajimaty* the lovely lady of the *Bhog Kul* and setting aside all worldly ties became a pious monk to save himself from being insturmental in the killing of animals brought for marital feast *Lord Vardman* the 24th *Tirthankar* of the *Jains*, own for himself the title of *Mahavir* a only by culture of this great and invincible force of *Ahimsa* It was he who launched a strong revolt against animal sacrifice and achieved marvellous success in his mission He was also called *Mahatma* (महत्पा)—a great saint on account of his large heartedness towards all beings, small or big He devoted a period of more than 12 years to silent meditation and per formance of austere *Tapas* It was after this strenuous trial of years that he merged out as a great Saint and apostle of *Ahimsa* and having attained *Keval Jnan* or the supreme knowledge was the most learned man of his time He was called 'खेयन्नए—खेद्न ' "one who understands the pain of others" अकमाइ मुके—अकसायिमुत्त —'one who is free from all passions' अभयकरे—"one who is an emblem of no fear to the entire existence'

Complete Ahimsa If Praticable

People generally doubt if *Ahimsa* is at all apractical religion *Mord Mahavir* 1 p oclaimed about 3000 years back that it was the eternal law—the real order of things for those who look to the welfare of their soul and there is nothing impracticable about it provided a man has the inner urge and faith alone which makes difficult things easy and makes what seems to the ordinary man only a theoretical

proposition Of course complete observance of *Ahimsa* requires great sacrifice For those who cannot make necessary sacrifice, it will always remain impracticable Greatness of sacrifice is no measure of impracticability If one cannot put forth the required efforts and pay the necessary price it is his incapacity It is quite true of *Ahimsa* as of other things to say "what one man has done others can do as well if the same amount of zeal, earnestness and efforts are forthcoming *Ahimsa* requires strenuous efforts and intermitent carefulness for its observance in all thoroughness

A de ote of complete *Ahimsa* is required to make great sacrifices The conditions laid down are as follows —

1 All ties with family and home should be cut off All attachment should be cast off All worldly possessions must be given up

2 18 kinds of sins should be avoided

3 A life-long vow to obesrve *Ahimsa* in word, mind, and speech in all its aspects should be taken

4 Life long vow of not to tell falsehood, not to steal, not to indulge in sexual intercourse of any kind and not to possess any property should be simultaneously adopted

5 Body, mind, and speech should be kept under constant vigilance and control

6 Necessary activities should be conducted with utmost care and [illegible] in an unfaulty manner Life should be quite

7 Life should be sustained on lifeless food and drink.

8 *Measured* food and drink may be taken between sun rise and sun set and nothing should be stored over night

9 The essentials of bare existence should be obtained *by innocent begging*

10 Life should be made completely self dependant and even the help of public service like Post and Telegraphs, *Railways or Airways should be abandoned*

11 Long halts should not be made at any particular place and a wandering life should be led No Monasteries Maths or Shrines should be kept or erected

A person who is willing to renounce the world as stated above and puts forth all his energies for the observance of the rules of conduct will find that *Ahimsa* is no longer an impracticable religion to him It may be asked 'the world is full of lives there is no place which is devoid of lives *even according to Jains* then how is it possible to lead a complete *Ahimsak* life Lives are bound to be killed inspite of all renunciations and keenest observance of the rules of conduct" The answer is a very simple one A man can be *held* responsible only for his actions but not for what happens to others Death, birth and continuation of life are the laws of the Universe *Jivas* are dying all around New births are taking place every mo ment Lives are seen existing all around But a man is not responsible for all these Death of a living being can not cast sins on a passer by nor can the peaceful life of a being make him meritorious Cessation of life is no *Himsa* nor the continua

tion of life is *Himsa* One who kills *Jivas* is *Himsak* and one who does not kill living beings is *Ahimsak* A person, who makes all possible renunciation for the observance of *Ahimsa*, is ever vigilant in its observance, avoids all posssible injuries to living beings, treats them all like his own soul and does not mind any sacrifice, discharges his responsibilities to the utmost and if *Jivas* are killed inspite of this he cannot be held responsible for the same *Jivas* die by their own *karmas* and also live by the same force How can a man who is non injurious in mind, body and speech and in all his activities be held responsible for the death of some body which he did not bring about willingly or consciously ? Such deaths are natural deaths and an *Ahimsak* can not be charged with any offence on that account Lord Mahavira has said—

सव्व भूयप भूयस्स सम्म भूयाइ पासओ
पिहिया सवस्स दन्तस्स पाव फम्मं न बन्धई
जय चरे जय चिट्ठे जय आसे जय सए
जय भुञ्जन्तो भासन्तो पाव कम्म न बन्धइ

"One who looks upon all beings as his own soul, one who has stopped his *Asravas* or inlets of sin and one who is self-restrained is not bound with sins Standing carefully, sitting carefully, sleeping carefully, eating carefully and speaking carefully a man is not bound by sins "

Once *Lord Mahavira* was asked what would be the consequences to a monk if eggs of a hen are crushed under his feet Mahavira replied "if the *Ahimsak* monk is carefully walking no sins would attach to him" This answer was also with the same back-ground as stated above The mensrea

for the crime of *Himsa* has been rightly set up above and a man is completely *Ahimsak* if he cannot be charged with the same

In keeping with the the above principle and as an amplification of the same it has been said that a man who does not take the vow of non injury, who is careless in his activities and movements and who does not make necessary sacrifice for the observance of the principle of *Ahimsa* commits the offence of *Himsa* even though no lives have been killed A military watchman who sleeps in the night and is not vigilant is guilty of offence even though no enemy raid has actually occured A cat may not be able to catch a mouse but it is cruel nevertheless as it is always after its hunt mentally A person hates somebody and resolves, on an occassion offering to kill him Is he not a murderer simply because he is not finding opportunity to commit murder? Similarly a person who harbours evil propensities, thoughts, or intentions towards living beings is a murderer in relation to them It is the self which is ultimately the wrongdoer If a person does not renounce sins if he is accustomed to act harmfully, and if he is not careful in the operations of his mind, speech and body he commits the sin of *Himsa* even though no *Jiva* has been killed Being unresigned and uncontrolled, he shows utter disregard for the lives of others day and night and is therefore committing *Himsa* every moment

It may be argued here how is *Ahimsa* practicable to a householder when he has to give up all worldly ties and wealth for its observance It is at the cost of all worldly enjoyment, so it is not practicable for mundane Souls The

question is a very important one but it is based on a false sense and exaggerated value of the worldly life What enjoyments there are in the worldly life to a person who looks to the realities of things and chalks out a way for the permanent good of the Soul? The worldly enjoyments are not permanent When they are not willingly abandoned they abandon the man in due course and leave a great agony in the mind behind You cannot give up eating betel nuts but what happens when teeth are no more? You cannot give up cinemas and theatres but what happens when you are blinded by irony of fate? You cannot make charity of your wealth but what happens when a tragedy like that of Quetta or that of Noakhali or Bihar happens? You always think of your wife and children but what happens when you happen to die before them? After all, the worldly pleasures and enjoyments are quite transitory and fleeting They are sensual and not natural and as such not at all of intrinsic value The world relations are also of temporary character (*Ahimsa* is supreme virtue having greatest intrinsic value in the uplift of the soul It gives ever lasting peace and tranquility to the Soul It is panacea for all social discords and conflicts It is something like a rocky shelter in the midst of the miseries of the world It is the purity of Soul and nobleness of feeling It is the purest of meditations It removes hostility and fosters universal brotherhood *Lord Mahavira* has very nicely said "*Ahimsa* is freedom from all miseries It is the true sacrifice of all sacrifices It is the abode of the liberated ones and the throne of the enlightened To those who aspire for happiness of the Soul, *Ahimsa* to them is like sky to the birds, water to the thirsty, bread to the hungry, boat to the drowning, medicine to the sick and a guide to lost ones in the woods" If *Ahimsa* is an essential virtue

for permanent good of the Soul then the sacrifice involved for its observance should never be taken as too great *Ahimsa* requires simply willing abandonment of transitory pleasures and short lived relations of the world—pleasures and relations which a man is forced to abandon against his will under the compulsion of Karmic laws! Is this sacrifice too great? Hitler sacrificed the best men and materials for wrecking vengeance on his enemies Why should not any one be competent to sacrifice his petty pleasures for the complete observance of *Ahimsa*? *Lord Mahavira* has said that as the razor cuts on its sharpness and the wheel moves on its orbit, similarly wise men base their lives on stern realities of things Men are born for the culture of religion only

Ahimsa and House-holder

It may be asked if it is not too much to expect such complete renunciation from every person There may be persons who choose to live as house-holders What is the path chalked out for them in Jainism? What is *Ahimsa* of the weak? This question is also very important and I may attempt a short answer here

There is no disappointment even for a house holder in Jainism What is Ahimsa? It is self restraint (अहिंसा निउना दिट्ठा सव्व भुएसु सजमो) and abstention from sins (उपरओ सव्व भूएसु) against living beings This abstention may be complete or partial as the case may be When it is complete, it is full *Ahimsa* and when it is partial, it is restricted *Ahimsa* A house holder has the choice to adopt *Ahimsa* of a restricted scope He may try and determine to be Non violent to the extent of his capacity As for example if a layman

thinks that he has not the moral strength to remain non-injurious when assaulted, it is his choice to take the vow of not killing innocent moving beings This is restricted *Ahimsa*

Jainism says that *Ahimsa* is always beneficial whatever may be the extent to which it is adopted Nectar is beneficial even if it is taken in small quantity In whatever sphere of life a man may be, he is capable of observing *Ahimsa* to some extent or other The Scheme of Jain *Ahimsa* is such that every body may find scope to practise it according to his capacity. Even at the risk of being lengthy I describe the Scheme in some detail here

Ahimsa should be the guiding principle of every human being Every body should abstain from all kinds of injury in all its aspects One who does not find himself sufficiently capable of observing complete Ahimsa, he should practise it as far as possible He should at least take the vow as follows —

1 I shall not kill intentionally any innocent living being of the moving species nor shall I cause another to do so by mind, speech and body

He should in particular avoid the following acts —

(1) Beating and chastisement of living beings ,
(2) Mutilating or castrating ,
(3) Tying up or entrapping living beings ,
(4) Overloading , and
(5) Withholding food and drink

2 To speak lies is also a sin against beings Falsehood should be completely abstained One who cannot avoid falsehood completely, he should at least avoid gross falsehood *e g* giving false evidence or appropriation of others property

He should in particular avoid the following acts —

(1) Falsely accusing others ,
(2) Disclosing secrets ,
(3) Betraying the confidence of one's wife ,
(4) Giving sinful advices , and
(5) Execution of false documents or forgery

3 To steal others properties is also *Himsa* Wealth and property are as dear as one's own life One should completely abstain from all kinds of stealing and take nothing which is not given by the owner One who cannot abstain from stealing completely he should at least give up gross stealing *e g* burglary, house breaking, pocket picking, dacoity and such other offences pertaining to property of others

He should in particular avoid the following Acts —

(1) Purchase of stolen articles ,
(2) Aiding and abeting stealing ,
(3) Illegal Traffic ,
(4) Use of false weights and measures , and
(5) Adulteration and dealing in adulterate products

4 Sexual intercourse is also an act of *Himsa* Innumerable lives are killed in the process of generation Carnal desire is in itself *Himsa* One should completely abstain from all kinds of sexual intercourse and sexual

pleasures in its entirety But one who is a householder, he should at least give up all kinds of adultery and be contented with one's own wife Excessive indulgence with one's own wife should also be shunned

He should in particular avoid the following acts —

(1) Indulgence with any keep or concubine,
(2) Indulgence with a widow, unmarried women or apros etc,
(3) Unnatural indulgence,
(4) Contracting marriages and sexual relations,
(5) Excessive sexual indulgence

5 Possession of property is due to greed and attachment to worldly pleasures and and as such is *Himsa* One should completely abstain from all attachment, external or internal One who is a householder and cannot abstain from possession altogether he should at least abstain from too much possession of the following groups of properties — (a) Land and House properties, (b) Gold and Silver, (c) Other valuables and Grains, (d) Beasts—Bipeds and Quadrupeds, and (e) Other household furniture This is possible by a limitation of the quantity and number of the articles for use

6 There are *Jivas* all around and in all directions Sins are committed against all these *Jivas* in ten directions, in various ways As a Householder adopts only limited vows, great scope is left for the commission of sins not covered by his restricted vows To narrow down and limit the scope, a vow called the *Dig Vrata* is enjoined A householder shoud limit his movements in all directions This is someting like putting a space-limit to activities and

consequently giving up *Himsa* completely outside a particular space-limit This can be easily practised by a little attention and carefulness

7 There are innumerable material objects of enjoy ments , some may be used repeatedly and others only ones *Himsa* is caused in the enjoyment of all these material objects There are 26 categories of these objects A man should avoid the enjoyment of these all in all completeness but a householder who cannot do so, should limit the number or quantity of the articles to be used by him This can be down for a day or for a fixed period This narrows done the fifth vow of partial renunciation of attachment or possession and intensifies the spirit of *Ahimsa*

There are *Fifteen* varieties of Business enterprises mentioned in Jain Scriptures such as those involving great use of fire , cutting of trees plants etc , making carts etc , castrating bullocks, clearing of Jungles by employment of fire and drying up lakes rivers etc These fifteen varieties of Business enterprises involve great injury to living beings and should be avoided by all laymen

8 There are various mental dispositions and propen sities which cause *Himsa* without any return whatsoever These mental *Himsas* and *Himsa* caused by carelessness should be avoided to strengthen the vow of *Ahimsa* Hanker ing after unobtained pleasures or anxiety for preserving the obtained ones and evil motives and designs are all *Apadhyan* involving *Himsa* for no self-interest To keep utensils containing oil etc , open and without lid is causing *Himsa* due to carelessness One also commits *Himsa* by distribution

of weapons of death like Bombs, Lathis and other armaments Sinful advice is also *Himsa* for no self-interest A layman should abstain from all these

9 The life of a complete votary of *Ahimsa* is devoid of all sinful activities Every man should culture a completely pious and sinless life but if a householder finds it difficult he should, at least, for a period of 48 minutes, take the vow of avoidance of sinful activities and try to repeat it as many times a day as possible This daily prayer and meditation of 48 minutes makes a person realise the importance of a life long vow to avoid all sinful activities This is, in a sense a time limit to the commission of *Himsa* not covered by other vows The status of a layman during the period of the vow, though to a lesser degree and extent, is very near to that of a complete *Ahimsak*

10 To intesify the restrictive vows of abstinence from possession and moving outside a particular area, a layman should observe the vow known an DESAVAKASIKA VRAT This vow is a further limitation of the sixth and seventh vows The general lifelong limitation of the area of movement or action is further narrowed down for a smaller period of a day Similarly the objects of use are further limited for that day and they are not used outside the limited area determined by this vow In this way the scope of *Ahimsa* is broadened and it goes on occupying greater and greater importance in the life of the house-holder

11 Eleventh rule of conduct which a layman is to observe is complete fasting from sunrise to sunrise and passing the night on lifeless ground on a simple and secluded bedding

and devoting oneself to meditation and atonement of sins In this vow complete *Brahmacharya* has got to be observed and the natural calls are performed, if necessary, at spots which are inspected and pre determined This also intensifies the vow of *Ahimsa* for that day

12 Various kinds of foods and eatables are prepared in a layman s house A layman is required to offer his food, and drink, medicines and other articles of use and in one s possession to a fully renunciated monk This willing donation of one's articles to pure Sadhus saves him from the sin which have been entailed, if he had used the same for his own nourishment and comforts

It will be seen from a careful study of the above vows as to how the life of a House holder has been tried to be made more and more *Ahimsak* and how by an unconscious and deeply thought of process the various injurious activities have been taken off the life of a Jain layman The principle of *Ahimsa* is deep rooted in all the vows Every vow deeply inculcates the idea of non injury and self restraint They are valuable rules of discipline and religious benevolence They teach at every step to be more and more *Ahimsak*

Ahimsa an uncompromisable Virtue

It may be said that Jainism preaches restricted *Ahimsa* in case of house holders and as such sanctions *Himsa* to some extent or other The reply is emphatic No" Jainism never sides with *Himsa* It does not compromise the principle of *Ahimsa* under any circumstances It explains its intention by a story as old as *Mahavira* himself There was a King who arrested five persons for a particular crime The father

of the arrested persons was very much concerned to learn the arrest of his sons He went to the King and began to beseech him to release his sons and not to hang them up The King was not willing Thereupon the father insisted on release at least of four of them and then of three, then of two and at last requested the king to release at least one of them Can it be said that the father was hostile towards any of his sons in getting the one released ? In the same way Jainism insists on non injury to all beings but to one who cannot give up injury to all beings it says "please give up *Ahimsa* of the innocent ones at least" It does not support hostility to others in the least The behaviour of life which is not injurious to living beings in any of the ways is called self restraint One who is self-restrained in body, mind and speech in all these ways is *Ahimsak* in its fullest sense One who is not so fully restrained but is restrained only to a certain extent or towards certain *Jivas* only is called restricted *Ahimsak* He is *Ahimsak* to the extent to which he observes non-injury and *Himsak* in respect of other sinful activities The unrestricted part of a house-holder's life is not at all commendable according to Jainism A man imposes upon himself the restriction of not hunting any fish He does not satisfy his wants by means of fishes He is therefore controlled so far as fishes are concerned and is *Ahimsak* in that respect But he meets his wants by means of vegetable bodies in general With regard to them he is uncontrolled and unrestrained and therefore sinful Similarly he is hostile to other beings in respect of whom he has not renounced the sins A fraction is always a part of the whole and similarly partial *Ahimsa* of the house holder leading as it does to the complete *Ahimsa* is always wholesome *Jainism* does not recognise

Himsa in the least It recognises partial *Ahimsa* inas much as it is a species of *Ahimsa*

Unchangable Definition of Ahimsa

A Fisherman has to hunt fishes to eke out his livlihood A cultivator has to grow and cut the harvest to support himself and his family How can these acts be described as violent when they are essential for the very existence of life !

So far as the Principle of *Ahimsa* is concerned it will remain the same for all and for ever It cannot be altered and varied to suit the convenience or sweet will of the person concerned It is a determined thing just like a yard which cannot be shortened or lengthened with each customer The measure must remain constant otherwise it can serve no purpose If *Ahimsa* is an eternal truth its conception must be determined and unvarying The definition of Geometrical line must remain the same whether the case is of a young boy unable to draw any but thick lines or a skilled artist competent to draw the finest ones reaching to a approximate perfection There can be no two definitions of *Ahimsa* There are infinite cases to meet and the definition of *Ahimsa* cannot be varied to meet these infinite cases However, there is no disappointment even for such persons like Fisher man etc in Jainism Even such persons may be *Ahimsaks* to a certain extent A Fisherman may take vow not to hunt more than a fixed number of fishes a day or to hunt in particular waters only A Cultivator may similarly impose upon himself the restriction of acreage of land to be sown He may take vow not to sow other than a particular variety of corn In this way every person can cultivate *Ahimsa* in his own sphere of life Jainism does not allow to call a life

religious when it is really sinful Jainism does not recognise circumstances in life as justifying *Himsa* It gives the true perspective of things It says "see and believe things as they are" If you are a fisherman you should know that you are committing *Himsa* in hunting fish and the plea of support of the family is no justification If you are a cultivator you must know that you are committing *Himsa* in tilling the land and in harvesting corn and the argument that cultivation is necessary for supporting the nation will not turn the sinful act into an act of *Ahimsa*" A Doctor may come forward and say animal experimentation and vivisection is necessary to find out new medicines for the welfare of humanity and therefore there is no *Himsa* in killing animals for research in medical science Some body will come out and say that animal sacrifice is necessary to propitiate gods and therefore there is no *Himsa* in killing goats for the purpose Some will say it is necessary for the establishment of Pakisthan to kill Hindus and Hindus will also say the vice-versa But an act of *Himsa* cannot be converted into that of *Ahimsa* simply by ascribing to it some motive or other Whatever may have been your motive if you are not self-restrained and *Ahimsak* in your mode of life, you are *Himsak* and sinful Jainism regards *Ahimsa* in renunciation of *Himsa* It does not call *Himsa* meritorious simply because you happen to have some reason or circumstances which prohibit you from giving up your calling or so called philanthropic work for the cause of humanity Jainism does not look to the circumstances of the person and his environments but regards an act of violence and unrestraint towards creatures as a sinful act in all cases

Self defence is regarded as an exonerating circumstances under the criminal law, what does Jainism say about it ?

Jainism does not distinguish between a foe and a friend It lays emphasis on alike treatment towards an enemy and a friend "समया सव्व भुयसु सत्तु मित्तेसु वा जगे।" It says culture a spirit of followship towards all "मेत्ति भूयहिं कप्पए" Do not be Vindictive towards any living being "न विरुज्झेज्ज केणइ" It will thus be seen that Jainism does not give moral support to killing even for self-defence On the otherhand it preaches that forbearance is the highest virtue (तितिक्खं परमं) and enjoins that even when assulted a votary of *Ahimsa* should not feel annoyed but should bear all tortures very calmly It teaches that soul is imperishable Body and Soul are distinct Annihilation of the body is not annihilation the Soul It says 'no matter whether body remains or perishes, Soul should be protected and religion should be preserved' Innumerable instances are there, where Jain Heroes have sacrificed their lives for the noble principle of *Ahimsa* *Gajsukhmal* a relation of *Srikrishna* was betrothed to the daughter of one Somal Just a few days before marriage, Gajsukhmal got himself initiated at the feet of *Tirthankar Arist Nemi* and soon after initiation took to holy meditation near a crematory Somal, the would be father in law, was very much annoyed at it and placed burning charcoals from pyre near by on the head of *Muni Gajsukhmal,* who was in deep meditation The whole body was burnt to Ashes but *Muni Gajsukmhal* did not break his meditation remained quite calm and composed, and did not retaliate the cruel Somal Another instance is that of *Muni Khandak* whose skin was striped off with razor yet he did not even scream a sigh from his mouth and allowed himself to be killed for the sake of his Soul The instance

of self-immolation at the alter of *Ahimsa* are too numerous to be recorded here.

On occasions of assault aggression or danger to life, the only path open to a *Ahimsak* is to depend upon persuasiveness It is only by change of heart that *Ahimsak* may seek to save himself The beautiful *Lady Rajimati*, who initiated herself into the holy order of Sadhvis, after *Aristhanemi* the 22nd *Tirthankar* gave up his intention to marry her, happened to make a short halt in a cave on a rainy day *Rathnemi*, the elder brother of *Aristanemi* was also a Sadhu and he was staying in that very cave *Rajimati* did not notice him and spread her clothes to dry them up *Rathnemi*, seeing *Rajimati* naked began to induce her to love him There was no protection for *Rajimati* She quickly folded her arms over her breast and sat down *Rajimati* saw that *Rathnemi's* strength of will was broken and temptation had got the better of him But she did not loose courage and began to address *Rathnemi* in most heroic words —"I should have no desire for you even if you were *Vaisramana* in beauty Fie upon you famous knight, who want to lick the vomited food for the sake of this transitory life To you death is honourable than life Both of us are born in noble families Let us firmly practise self-control If you fall in love with any women you see, you will be like a Hada tree that can be uprooted by a gust of wind He cannot be said to be a Tyagi in its true sense, who does not find pleasure in garments, women and bed simply because he has not got them He alone is a real *Tyagi* who turns his back even towards enjoyments at his disposal" Having heard these well-spoken words *Rathnemi* returned to his

senses like an elephant driven by the hook Thus the pious lady *Rajimati* true to self control and her vows, was successful in defending herself and maintained the honour of her clan and family and her own chastity by change of the heart of *Rathnemi*

Another very interesting instance is that of layman *Sudarshan* He was a layman desciple of *Lord Mahavira* and was a resident of the famous city of *Rajgriha* Outside the skirts of *Rajgriha* lived a gardener named *Arjunaka* Gardener's wife's name was Bandumati One day Bandumati was attacked by some wealthy young man of *Rajgriha*, who violated her chastity From that day the Gardener *Arjunaka* become a very cruel man The ghost of violence was in him in full rampant and he began to kill six men and one woman every day by his club *Maharaj Srenika*, king of *Rajgriha* heard of this and warned the people by beat of drums not to go outside the city lest they may be killed Once *Lord Mahavira* happened to come to that side and stayed in Gunshilak Chaitya outside the skirts of *Rajgriha* *Sravak Sudarshan* heard of this and resolved to go to that part of the city to pay his respectful homage to *Lord Mahavira* and *would not desist* inspite of all requests from all kiths and kins Alone he went out of the city As soon as he was perceived by the *Arjunaka* he began to wave his Mugdar and ran towards *Sudharshan* to kill him *Sudharshan* was not a bit nervous He chose a small spot for himself and folded his hands together in prayer and uttered 'My salutation to the *Arahats* and *Siddhas* My salutation to *Lord Mahavira*, the Saviour of the world I was so long observer of the

restricted vows, now you as my witness I take upon myself the fuller vows I renounce the 18 kinds of sins and give up all kinds of food and drink If I survive this ordeal I shall have option to terminate my determination to fast unto death If I do not survive I shall stick to my determination till the last moment" Having made this firm resolve *Sudarshan* stood in silent meditation Arjunak was simply amazed at this calm posture He stood dumbfounded and could not attack *Sudarshan* He simply stared at his face as if he was drawing a contrast between his cruel life and the calm and serene life of *Sravak Sudarshan* He was so much impressed by the calmness that prevailed on the face of *Sravak Sudarshan* that the Ghost in him was out and he fell down senseless on the ground with club off *Sravak Sudarshan* was out of danger His vow having been fulfiled, was terminated automatically *Arjunaka* recovered his senses a little while later and accompanied *Sravak Sudarshan* to pay his homage to *Lord Mahavira* He was so much impressed by the preaching of *Lord Mahavira* that he adopted the life of a full *Ahimsak* His life was then an ideal one People used to stone him, beat and kick him as the old murderer but *Sadhu Arjunaka* would not even utter a single word in protest He would calmly forbear all these tortures A cruel murderer was thus converted into a staunch votary of *Ahimsa* It was only by change of heart that *Sravak Sudarshan* was able to save himself in the worst of circumstances

Ahimsa and Women

A question may be asked—what to do when persuasiveness is of no avail ? How can a woman protect her chastity in such circumstances ?

The question is a very grave one To succum to live a life of shame is cowardice and to resort to violence for self protection is also cowardice as it shows a lack of faith in the efficacy of Ahimsa Then how to get out of this Dilemma ? The answer is quite simple "Die for the sake of thy religion Do not succum Do not resort to violent retaliation but be prepared for a calm death and look to meditation and prayer as thy only saviours Allow thy self to be killed in silent meditation If the assailent is aggressive and bent upon doing mischief abandon thy body in an innocent way and thus make futile all attempts of the Aggressor" It is interesting to note that *Lord Mahavira* has prescribed that in these circumstances a *Sadhvi* may strangle herself to death rather than allow herself to be violeted In fact Jain *Nuns* may use strings with them for strangling themselves if any occasion arises at all

Cannot a lay woman use weapons in self defence ? Nuns are under vows of complete *Ahimsa* They cannot take recourse to any kind of force much less to sword or dagger for their protection Lay women are in different circumstances Why should not they use weapons for safe guarding their person ?

As cowardliness is no virtue for Nuns so also it is not for lay women They should not succum themselves to any assault much less to injury to their chastity If they have to choose between cowardice or shamless life and violence let them not choose the first one When the choice is between violence and non violence let them not be violent Remember that violence is also no guarantee for self protection It is a relative term Of what avail can violence be against violence

when the aggressive side is more stronger, or better equipped or put in better circumstances or have pre planned designs It is only a pious chivalry which can save one's honour in odd circumstances The tragedies of Noakhali and Bihar would not have been so painful if women there would have played their part well and instead of succuming would have given up their lives for the sake of their honour *Ahimsa* is the only invincible force or weapon for an otherwise ill equipped victim Self protection must come from within It must not in any circumstances be allowed to depend on outward strength Protective weapons may be snatched but the moral force and will not to allow oneself to be molested in any circumstances always remain self-protected It is a perennial source of strength which cannot be snatched or detached Moral strength of womanhood is the greatest and the most invincible force which can protect its honour in all circumstances

Of course when a lay woman is under the restricted vow of *Ahimsa*, she has for her choice the path of counter attacks as well It is for her to decide to take to violence or not It is true that even if she decides to take to violent methods it does not mutilate her vow as it is only to refrain from killing innocent beings But Jainism specifically points out at the same time that an act which does not break a vow cannot be taken as tantamounting to support it An act may be sinful even without doing any violence to the vow Only that act is sinless which supports the vow or intensifies the same Looking from this view point, the act of killing even an aggressor cannot be countenanced and called meritorius It is always sinful as it is not an specie of *Ahimsa* but only an expression of disability or

weakness of the soul within to act non violently in certain circumstances

Ahimsa and Protection

The question of protection of others is also allied to the question of self defence, as the former is only an amplification of the latter Self defence when spoken in relation to others is protection What is the duty of a person when he is confronted with the problem of protection of others ?

I shall attempt a brief reply to this question as well The question will be best understood if it is split up into four parts viz (1) when the protected and the protector are both complete *Ahimsak*, (2) when the protected is not fully *Ahimsak* but the protector is fully so, (3) when the protected is fully *Ahimsak* but the protector is not so, and (4) when the protector is partially *Ahimsak* and the protected is also so

(1) In the first case as the protector is fully *Ahimsak* he cannot take recourse to violence without breaking the first great vow of non injury to all However pious the life of the protected person may be, it should not be protected by doing violence to one's own vow The sanctity of vow should be maintained at all costs This is the preaching of Jainism We may cite here two instances from Jain scriptures to make our view point more clear *Mahavira* was still in his formative period He had not yet acquired *Kewal Jnan* or supreme knowledge In this state of his monk life he was accompanied by one *Gosala*, who afterwards turned out to be his great rival He was very mischievious and on account of his mischievious activity was instrumental in arousing a great recluse into rage

The recluse possessed the faculty of *Tejo Labdhi*—the power to burn objects upto a certain distance *Lord Mahavira* possessed the counter power called the *Shital Labdhi* and he used this power to protect *Gosala* from being burnt to ashes Commenting on this incident saint *Bhikanji*, a great apostle and thinker of the 19th Centuary, has said "This was a faulty step taken by *Mahavira* At that time *Mahavira* was possessed of all the eight *Karmas* He was still in a formative state and was under the influence of all *Karmic* forces and it is no wonder if he went stray" Another incident happened in the life time of the very *Tirthankar* after he had attained the supreme knowledge This time *Lord Mahavira* did not use the counter-power and kept himself aloof He did not try to protect his two pious Sadhus by use of force *Raichand Bhai*, a great Jain philosopher, commenting on this incident has said at one place—'Had *Lord Mahavira* used his psychic power for the protection of his Sadhus he would have had to take another birth" This will at once show how the use of force for protection of others is disregarded by Jains as sinful It is thus apparent that according to Jainism a Sadhu cannot protect another Sadhu when being attacked by a wild beast by killing or using any other force against it Similarly he cannot protect a Sadhwi, from the attacks of a licentious person by doing away with him He can only preach religion and in case it fails to influence, he would leave the Sadhwi to die a brave and heroic death and would exhort her to remain firm and not to give up her religion in any circumstances It is said

अरिहंता भगवतो अहियं घ हिय घ न पि इह किंचि
घारंति भारयति य, घित्तूण जण चला हत्थे

'*Arhat Bhagwans* never use any force to desist people from what is harmful to them nor do they use it to persist them to do what is beneficial to them They never forcibly hold hands and guide people but simply preach (उवएस पुण त दिंति) what is beneficial and of permanent good"

A person who maintains perfect equanimity of mind in such exciting circumstances is regarded as having observed non violence in its true spirit A person who fails to maintain mental equilibrium and shows feelings of affection towards the victim or feelings of hatred towards the assailant is called the transgressor of the vow of *Ahimsa* *Saint Bhicanji* the great votary of *Ahimsa,* while explaining the discourses of *Lord Mahavira,* the great hero of non violence has remarked at more than one place that the feeling of love or attachment and hatred or disgust are both violence in disguise and a true lover of *Ahimsa* should save himself from both kinds of feelings There is a very interesting story on the point There was a renowned *Jain Monk* namely *Muni Skhandak* who had 500 monk disciples under his leadership When *Skhandak* was a house holder he was a great debator and was successful in defeating another great philosopher of his time This philosopher was attached to some King After *Skhandak* become monk he happened to stay in a garden of that King and the philosopher now found opportunity to take revenge He managed to put deadly weapons underground in the garden and poisoned the mind of the king that the monks were dacoits in disguise The king on investigation found the weapons underground and believing the philosopher to be true, ordered him to execute all the sadhus to death One by one 499 sadhus were put in an oil crusher and squeezed to death before the very eyes of

Skhandak. *Skhandak* was quite unmoved even at this terrible slaughter. As each *Sadhu* was being taken to the crusher, he was instructing him to remain non-violent and not to entertain even hostile thoughts in mind. All the *Sadhus* faced the situation very calmly and died without the least thought of enmity towards the philosopher. Now came the turn of the last disciple. He was quite young. The idea of his death moved *Skhandak* and taking pity on him, he began to beseech the philosopher for mercy. But as the latter did not pay heed to his request he got angry and began to curse the philosopher. After all *Skhandak* was also put into the crusher but he could not recoup his mental equilibrium and was killed, when he was full of agony and wrath towards the philosopher. Now it has been said in *Jain* scriptures that *Skhandak* was a *Biradhak* i.e. one who did not observe the vow of *Ahimsa* in its true sense, and his disciples were *Aradhak* as they observed it in its true spirit. There was attachment in the heart of *Skhandak* which caused him to be unequanimous towards his enemy and thus he fell down from his great vow of *Ahimsa*. It has been said in *Jain* Scriptures:

सव्व जग तु समयाणुपेही
पियमप्पिय कस्सइ णा करेज्जा
जो समो सव्व भूएसु
तस्स सामाइय होइ

"Look at beings with equanimity. Do not be favourable to some body and inimical to others. One who is equally behaved to all beings is verily the true observer of religion of abstinence from all sins."

It is of these instructions contained in the *Jain* scriptures that a *Jain* monk has to keep himself quite aloof from violence or force of any kind and even in the gravest of situations he cannot take recourse to them for the protection of his brother monk or even a nun He has been taught to culture a spirit of non violence even against the worst form of aggressor and death to him is not defeat if the vow of non-violence is preserved For him vanquished is he who falls from his vow in critical moments and not one who sacrifices his life for its sake His is the greatest victory who dies for the cause of *Ahimsa*

People will say how can a non violent person see barbarities committed before his eyes ? He must interfere to protect the weaker in the combat This is the practical side of *Ahimsa* Otherwise how is *Ahimsa* an active force ?

Jainism makes it clear that perpetration of barbarities before one s eyes does not make one sinful provided he does not countenance it To co operate with aggressor is also violence according to *Jainism* It lays greatest emphasis on non cooperation with *Himsa* and the entire strength of *Ahimsa* lies in this spirit of non co operation It is quite difficult, if not impossible, to change the heart of man and make him see wrong in his deeds by use of force and unless the heart is changed the barbarity exists Is it possible to stop barbarity without mental change ? So long as the seed exists, the tree cannot be said to have been uprooted It is with this frame of mind that *Jainism* preaches complete calmness of mind even in most exciting circumstances It teaches to throw moral influence of the purest character and where it fails to act, *Jainism* is of opinion that physical force cannot be of

any avail It is a matter of every day occurrence that application of force towards a cruel person always fosters bitterness in his mind To engender feelings of hatred, anger or wrath by use of force is itself violence and a votary of complete *Ahimsa* cannot be a party to commission of *Himsa* in any form It has been said "सरिसो होई बालाण तम्हा भिक्खू न संजले"— "one who fights anger with anger is himself in the category of the fallen and fools" To resist force with force is to put Ghee in burning fire Fire of Anger can be quenched only by calmness of mind 'उवसमेण हणे कोह'—'Conquer anger by amity"—is the commandment of *Lord Mahavira* There can be affinity only between unlikes "Likes repel, unlikes attract" This is not only a law which governs the physical world but also applies in the field of human psychology To eradicate violence, non-violence is the only remedy Blood stains cannot be removed by blood—"लोही स्यू खरड्यो पीताम्बर लोही स्यु केम धुपावे रे ?" Barbarism and blood-shed cannot be eradicated by barbarism and blood shed in its turn

Ahimsa is fight against evil propensities This fight is invisible but its value cannot be underrated only for that An *Ahimsak* may be quite passive so far as outer foes are concerned but he is ever vigilant and active in eradicating the inner foes Thus *Ahimsa* is quite potential It is the greatest fighting force against all evils Whoever handles this weapon of *Ahimsa* has to remain ever-active in his life. It is only on account of this vehement struggle involved in the internal battle that it has been called the highest victory—'परमो जओ'

(2) Now let us come to the second case where the protector is a complete *Ahimsak* but the protected is either partially *Ahimsak* or not at all so A mouse is being attacked by a cat, a fly is caught in a spider's web what should a complete non violent person do? The question of change of heart does not arise here

The answer is quite simple and easily deducible from what has already been discussed in detail above It is no *Ahimsa* to smite one and protect the other If the cat is starved to death and the mouse is saved it is only shifting the incidence Sympathy on one side coincides with apathy on the other The religion of votary of *Ahimsa* is to remain indifferent in such circumstances He has no right to save one at the cost of another Why should he cause starvation to the cat and the spider and save the mouse and the fly at their cost? Why should he be so concerned for the one and not at all for the other? Why should there be any distinction between the lives of different beings in the eyes of a non violent person? "He should be the protector of all and cruel to none'— (पिहिया सवस्स। तिथिहेण तायो। नय पित्तासप पर) This is the preaching of *Lord Mahavira* then why should he be inequitable?

It may be argued that intention is the main thing In the above instances the intention is to protect the mouse or the fly and not at all to cause starvation to the cat or the spider? Then why should these acts be treated as act of violence?

The answer is very simple *Saint Bhicanji* has very wittingly remarked "A man had a sword He put it on the

throat of a man and began to move it to and fro When he was asked not to kill the person he remarked 'I am not killing the man I am simply testing the sharpness of the sword' Is not this man a murderer ? Similarly, whatever may be the intention, one who causes the starvation of the cat or the spider is a sinner"

A question may arise Suppose a person is distributing corns among famine-stricken people and the distributor asks a votary of *Ahimsa* as to what he thinks of his action Whether it is meritorious or sinful ? What should be the reply of the votary of *Ahimsa* ?

A votary of *Ahimsa* is sometimes on the horns of a dilemma He is sometimes between two fires *Lord Mahavira* has specifically instructed that a votary of *Ahimsa* should keep himself silent on such occasions He should not say that it is a meritorious act because it is his duty to see that he does not consent to the killing of any being whether moving or not moving Similarly he should not say that the act is sinful because he would then be instrumental in preventing the distribution of alms to the hungry people Those who praise the gift are accessory to the killing of corn life Those who forbid it deprive others of the means of subsistence A votary of *Ahimsa* should keep himself silent and save himself from being exposed to sin either way

There is a charming story in *Panchatantra* which beautifully depicts the *Jain* theology and for making our view-point more clear we quote the same here

"Three *Sadhus* were peforming austerities on the bank of a river They acquired marvellous power on account of

their austere penances and their bowls & blankets became fixed in the sky A crane came there and stood with one leg on the earth and the other uplifted as if in meditation Soon a fish was seen and the crane picked it up with his beak At this sight one of the *Sadhus* began crying out "Protect! Protect the fish! No sooner these words were uttered the bowls and blanket of the *Sadhu* fell down from the sky The austere life was destroyed

The second *Sadhu* saw this and thought that as the first *Sadhu* asked to protect the fish, his psychic power was lost so attempt should be made to see that the fish is not protected Having thought this he began to shout—'do not save the fish—do not save it!" As soon as these words were uttered his bowl and blanket also fell down

The third *Sadhu* saw this and thought it is harmful to try either way Let me remain neutral Having thought this he kept himself absorbed in meditation His bowl and blanket remained fixed in the sky as before"

The substance is one who does not get himself interested in act of sympathy or apathy his religion lives permanently and one who loses his equanimity by engaging himself in the activity of protecting or not protecting he loses his religion too *Saint Bhicanji* has very nicely said —

"There can be no piety in acts involving *Himsa* and no *Himsa* in acts involving piety As Sun and shadow are different so also the sinful acts and the meritorious acts are different

Ahimsa to be a virtue must be unadultered with *Himsa* As the East and West i e two directions cannot meet, in the same way mercy is where there is no *Himsa*

The entire citadel of *Jainism* is built on mercy Those who seek after truth will find ample evidence on the point If merit accrues out of acts of violence then Ghee must also be expected to come out of churning the water"

(3) Now we come to the third case where the protector is partially *Ahimsak* and the protected is completly *Ahimsak*

Even in this case the basic principles to be applied are the same Even for the protection of a complete observer of *Ahimsa*, if recourse is taken to *Himsa* it is sinful and not at all meritorious No protection is meritorious which is not in keeping with the religious principles of a complete votary of *Ahimsa* and which slackens, the spirit of complete renunciation Suppose a *Sadhu* is thirsty and is on the verg of death Being a complete *Ahimsak* he cannot partake of living water If some body comes and offers him such water to drink he cannot be called non-violent as he is causing death to water-lives and also inducing the *Sadhu* to fall from his vow of complete *Ahimsa* Similarly if any one erects a house, monastery, shrine or temple for the residence of a *Sadhu* or devotee of complete *Ahimsa*, he is guilty of the sin of violence as Earth, Water etc and moving lives like small insects are killed in such action Benevolent deeds involving injury to living beings even when directed to benefit a completely non-violent person are sinful A true votary of complete *Ahimsa* will never make himself a party to these sinful acts by enjoying or making use of the things prepared

for them When acts of benevolence involving injury to small beings are sinful the protection of a *Sadhu* by killing the enemy or the cruel animal cannot but be the same A *Sadhu* cannot eulogise any of the above acts If he does so he falls from his vow of complete *Ahimsa*

It may be argued that the small insects and animals are beings of a lower plane Causing injury to them may be sinful but the merit accruing out of protection offered to human beings especially to a pious saint is greater and outweighs the sin incurred So ultimately the act of protection is virtuous inspite of the little *Himsa* involved in the same

Jainism regards all beings as possessed of the same conscious soul There is no difference between the soul of one-organned and the five-organned rational beings So killing of the one for the sake of the other cannot be called meritorious in any sense A human being assuming superiority puts greater value to his own comforts but this is only selfishness of the person enjoying the previleged position According to *Jainism* no act can be meritorious if it involves *Himsa* An act cannot be both sinful and meritorious at the same time As milk cannot come out by churning the water similarly no merit can accrue out of a violent act however insignificant it may be in a layman's eyes The principle of *Anekantbad* or many foldness of views or angles has no application whatsoever in these cases A seed cannot bear two kinds of fruits, similarly an act while being sinful cannot be meritorious at the same time

Saint Bhikanji has at one place very wittingly emarked Suppose a *Brahmin* has a small handkerchief

Some body comes and snatches it from him and puts it in the pocket of a rich Bridegroom going to his father-in-law's house What will you think of the act ? Will not the person doing so be called a plunderer ? Similarly a person who kills beings for the comforts of a human being or a piously saint is murderer if he does injury to the lives of even small beings Thus it is clear that killing does not find favour with *Jainism* even in circumstances where the protected person is completely non violent and is a pious saint and great benefactor of mankind

(4) Now we come to the fourth case where the protected and the protector are on the same plane not as complete *Ahimsaks* as in the first case but as being partial *Ahimsaks* or no *Ahimsaks* at all

According to *Jainism* a person who does not renounce *Himsa* at all is called *Asanyami* or completely unrestrained and one who renounces *Himsa* to some extent is called *Sanyamasanyami* or partially restrained The worldly activities of an unrestrained or partially restrained person are all sinful and violent as they are directed towards material achievements and not towards spiritual advancement Whoever protects a violent person supports his violent existence and is sinful *Jainism* says "Dont live unrestrained life Neither have love for the unrestrained life of others If anything is to be loved it is religion and the renouncing of sinful activities "

Jainism regards non-violence as the eternal law and even in cases where both the protected and protector are *Himsaks* the same law is allowed to prevail

It says 'Death is an eternal law It is a stern reality which is sure *to be fulfiled some day or other* There is nothing therefore to be worried at the approach of death which must come sooner or later whether one wishes it or not It may come as a natural event in due course or as a catastrophy suddenly It makes no difference how it comes Then why should it be feared and not faced calmly There is nothing to shudder at the approach of a certain fact One should not get angry or annoyed at the sight of barbarities and murder and indulge one self in the very act which is revolting to one's own sentiment when committed by others

It may be asked a house holder has parents, children, wife attendants and other male and female members How should he behave when assaulted as in Noakhali and Bihar

Such calamities themselves prove the futility of violent methods Protection by violence is out of question when attacked by an overwhelming number If anything can offer protection in such acute circumstances, it is *Ahimsa* alone Virtue of non-violence should be demonstrated by utter calmness and complete fearlessness Moral influence should be thrown If that proves futile death should be met with calmness as a matter of course Prayer for self purification should be resorted to No attachment for the body should be maintained Hatred malice or violence has been declared sinful even in these circumstances There should be no panic no betrayal of each other but pious and ennobling religious songs should be sung to keep the moral strength high This is the true religion which should guide the relations even between persons who are not devoted to non-violence in full or even partially if they find

themselves morally so weak as not to be able to desist from violent retaliation, it is their choice But it is no act of *Ahimsa* or an act ennobling the soul and causing merit There are thousands of acts which worldly people do reciprocally and for mutual advantage but all such acts cannot be labelled as religious There are thousands of acts which may be thought necessary to be done for co operative life and protection of common interest but their sanction should not be sought in religion A man builds a palatial house at the cost of innumerable small lives, will it be called an act of religion simply because it adds to his comfort and the comfort of the members of his family ? As there is no religion in errecting a building yet it is errected with a feeling of personal comfort, similary acts of communal and national growth and worldly prosperity may be undertaken from a sense of reciprocal feeling of belonging to the same stock, nation or community It is not necessary that they should have their inspiration in religion *Jainism* does not support acts of '*Himsa* whatever may be the aim for which they are undertaken

Ahimsa and outward influence

There is a Butcher who is taking goats for slaughter A rich person offers money and releases the goats Sympathy here does not coincide with apathy to anybody Is not this act of protection meritorius ?

According to Jainsim there are five cardinal sins (1) to kill beings, (2) to tell lies, (3) to steal others property, (4) to indulge in sexual intercourse, and (5) to keep and enjoy wealth and earthly possessions Jainism says that to

commit any of the sins in any of the ways to protect others is sinful and no sort of merit accrues To make the truth of this general principle self evident we shall give here some illustrations

A thief runs away with stolen properties The owner follows him and tries to trace him out While in this pursuit he meets two persons who know the whereabouts of the thief On the owner's asking the whereabouts of the thief, one of the person keeps silent but the other gives him a wrong direction The owner goes stray and misses the thief and consequently his valuables It is apparent that the first person does not incur any sin as he refrains from falsehood or harmful truth but what about the second person who gives the wrong information and misguides the owner Is this act of his meritorious ?

A severe famine breaks out Poor people are seen dying out of hunger A band of philanthropic persons plunder the graneries of a well to do person and feed the poor Is this act religious on the part of the plunderers ?

A couple is passing through a desert A lustful person attacks the husband and tries to kill him The lady requests the assailant to desist from murder and just to save her husband voluntarily offers her body to that person Is this act meritorious ?

If the answer is in the negative, Jainism asks how can the act of saving the goats by offering wealth be meritorious ? A votary of complete *Ahimsa* is also a complete renouncer of wealth Possession of any kind is incompatible with the vow of *Ahimsa* Whoever gives wealth to others

commits the sin of *Parigraha* as he helps other in enjoying the same By giving money to a butcher the rich man enables him to purchase a greater number of goats and to make a good turnover rapidly This intensifies the act of slaughter In no circumstances it puts a stop to its recurrence in future This is supporting *Himsa* indirectly How can an act which multiplies the commission of *Himsa* be called meritorious? To offer *Parigraha* is as sinful as the commission of the other sins and a person should not try to save others by commission of sins himself According to Jainism sins follow the doer and no one is exonerable from the fruits thereof A poppy seed cannot be expected to bring forth a mangoe tree Similarly sinful acts cannot be expected to yield virtuous results even if they result in the protection of certain beings

It is no religion to save lives by the use of threat, force, allurement of wealth or any other sinful influence or methods This is simply causing the degradation of one's own soul for the supposed good of others

Ahimsa, a virtue of the heart

Ahimsa is a religion of the heart and it cannot be forced upon anybody To try to compel or oblige others to be non-violent is itself violence and a votary of *Ahimsa* cannot take recourse to the same *Ahimsa* is a creed It requires inner recognition and purity of feelings No one can be *Ahimsak* without inner appreciation and deep faith in the virtue of non-violence *Saint Bhicanji* has rightly remarked 'There are seven great addictions according to Jainism viz (1) Gambling, (2) Meat eating, (3) Drinking

liquors, (4) Visiting houses of ill-fame, (5) Hunting, (6) Stealing and (7) Adultery Any person who desists forcibly anybody even from these great vices is a sinner according to Jainism To force anything upon a person against his will is violence pure and simple One who obstructs the sense pleasures of addicted persons, or curbs their desire against their will, acquires the karmas infatuating the soul A person can be made virtuous only by the change of heart and moral influence No one can be forced to be good Non violence of the heart is the essential foundation of a noble life Non violence of the body is of no avail if the heart goes on killing and there is no mind and will to be non-violent Non violence of the person in fetters is the non violence of the unwilling and the forced and is not at all purifying

There was a butcher named *Kalsaukarika* in the times of *Lord Mahavira* He used to slaughter one hundred goats every day He was so cruel as nobody could induce him to stop slaughter even for a day One day Emperor *Srenika* went to pay his obeisance to *Lord Mahavira* A leper also went to pay homage to the *Lord* After paying his respects the leper said that it is better for *Srenika* to live long When asked about the inner significance of this utterance of the leper, *Lord Mahavira* explained to *Srenika* that after his death he was to go to hell So it is better that he should live long as he was in a happy state in his present life Having heard this about his future life *Srenika* became quite sad and began to ask the *Lord* if there was any way out from the foretold future life *Lord Mahavira* said that it was possible only if *Kalsaukarika* stopped slaughter for a day *Srenika* was quite glad to hear this as he thought it very easy He ordered to call the butcher and asked him

to desist from slaughter for a day The butcher was not willing and did not consent *Srenika* got angry and ordered to bind him hand and feet and put him in a well

After the day was over *Srenika* went over to *Lord Mahavira* again and told him that butcher did not kill any goat that day and that he was lucky enough to avert his fate *Lord Mahavira* said 'you are doomed for hell It is true that the butcher had no goats to kill but what of that ? He took filth off his body, converted the same into 100 goats by the help of water and killed them one by one with his finger Though his hand and feet were not free yet his mind was virulently active and killed goats in imagination The butcher did not desist but he was forced to desist from physical violence ' The story amply illustrates that there is no abstinence without consent or consciousness Abstinence is what is of one's one choice and free-will It cannot be imposed

Why is Ahimsa a Virtue ?

Ahimsa is a virtuous attitude of mind *Lord Mahavira* has said "As water passes away from a high level so the sins of one who is placed on the terrace of non violence goes of the soul ' Killing of others is the greatest sin and non violence the supreme virtue *Lord Mahavira* has placed *Ahimsa* as the first among the virtues to be cultivated for the purification of soul He has called it the ennobling self restraint

तत्थिम पढम ठाण महावीरेण देसिग
अहिंसा निउणा दिट्ठा सव्व भूएसु सयमा ।

According of *Him* it is a firm island in a surging ocean and the only resort in the frowning sea He has called *Ahimsa* as the highest knowledge of the seers—the quintessence of their wisdom *Himsa* is the root of all vices It is hostility and lack of goodwill against the living creatures It is ill treatment of the worst form It is a cause of great fear and breeding ground for enmity *Ahimsa* is, therefore, a *virtue in itself* and its value is *self determined* *It is a* guarantee of good behaviour from one's own self and being the highest self culture is most ennobling It is why *Lord Mahavira* has said 'Be non violent for thy own sake The good of your own soul requires you to be non violent It is no obligation or charity towards any body"

People say *Ahimsa* is a great virtue as it offers protection to other beings *Ahimsa* is meritorious on account of its protective value It is meant for protecting others *Lord Mahavira* has on the other hand said that *Ahimsa* is a great virtue as it is abstinence from the sin of *Himsa* or hurting others It is an antidote to self pollution and an abandonment of evil tendencies One who takes the vow to abstain himself from violence and does all in his power to stick to it, is non violent even though lives are killed On the otherhand a person who is negligent in observing his vow strictly or does not take the vow to abstain from any injury or for whom non injury is only a matter of chance and not of intentional volition is sinful even if no lives are killed There is no relation as that of cause and effect between *Ahimsa* and saving of lives Whether lives are killed or not killed a person who *does not* consciously and carefully observe his vow is guilty of the

offence of *Himsa* Similarly a person who consciously observes his vow is not bound by any karmas even though lives are killed It has been nicely said —

मरदुव जियदुजीवो, अयदाचारस्सणिच्छिदा हिंसा।
पयदस्सणत्थि बंधो, हिंसामित्तेण समिदस्स॥

Again it has been said —

"A careless soul under the influence of passions, first injures the self, through the self, whether there is subsequently an injury caused to another being or not is immaterial"

यस्मात्सकषाय सन् हन्त्यात्मा प्रथममात्मनाऽऽत्मानम्
पश्चाज्जायेत न वा हिंसा प्राण्यन्तराणां तु।
जीव वहो अप्पवहो जीवदया अप्पणो दया होइ
तासव्य जीव हिंसा परिचत्ता अत्तकामेहिं।

From what has been said above it is quite clear that *Jain Ahimsa* lays emphasis on purification of the soul by abstinence from *Himsa* and is not concerned whether lives are saved or not It preaches virtue for virtue's sake It preaches *Ahimsa* for the sake of saving the soul from the sin of *Himsa* and not for protecting other beings who may or may not be protected *Lord Mahavira* has said that a person who steadily evolves the virtue of *Ahimsa* attains completeness day by day like the waking bright moon on the full moon day and a person who developes violence gradually wanes and vanishes in darkness like the waning moon on the dark moon day *Ahimsa* wipes off the sins and purifies the soul *Himsa* taints it with vice and darkens it *Ahimsa* is an essential virtue for the upliftment of the soul *Himsa* pulls it down and soils it

Purification of soul is the highest aim and *Ahimsa* is an infallible means to this end It is, therefore for the ennobling of the soul that the culture of *Ahimsa* is essential *Saint Bhicanji* has very nicely dealt on the subject as follows

"People say 'saving of life is the cause and removing of sins is the effect There can be no effect without cause How can there be merits in *Ahimsa* without the cause—the consequential saving of beings?' Those who argue thus are wrong No doubt removing of sin is the effect but is it the effect of savings lives? Is it a certainty that no lives will be killed after a person becomes completely non violent? Can it be said that no lives are killed by a completely non violent *Sadhu* while walking, standing or doing such other acts? *Jivas* always die of their own Karmas and a person who is non violent in all its mode is not responsible for their death even though caused through the instrumentality of his body Due to full self restraint and purity of heart the elements of *Himsa* are absent Life long fast has been prescribed as a religious act by *Lord Mahavira* and death is a sure outcome of this life long fast but can the act be called violent for this reason? A wicked person lives on his wickedness and tries to save himself day and night Is it *Ahimsa* simply because life is saved? *Ahimsa* generates the feeling of equanimity or of looking all beings as one's own soul It is a restraint upon anger pride, deceit and greed It is a shut door against sins It destroys the old sins It is on account of this purifying influence that *Ahimsa* has been regarded as a great virtue The removing of sins is due to this purification of heart and is not due to the protection, if any, indirectly extended to other beings Protection to beings may be one of the resultants but

it is not with this view that the vow of *Ahimsa* is undertaken It is wrong to suggest that the merit of *Ahimsa* rests on the protection it offers to other beings *Ahimsa* is a virtue on account of its intrinsic quality and purifying character Suppose a person takes a vow not to cut any tree The tree is saved Another takes vow not to steal Others property is saved Religion does not consist in the saving of the tree or the protection afforded to the wealth of others The religion is somewhere beyond—it is in the self-restraint imposed on one's inclination to be cruel to trees or to rob others of their wealth As evil propensities are restricted and as attachment is removed the soul purifies itself and the religion lies in this self purification To make the matter more clear another example may be given Suppose there is a pros The Lover of the pros takes upon himself the vow of not visiting houses of ill fame Pros hears of this tries to persuade her lover to give up the vow but he sticks to the same inspite of all temptations The pros becomes disappointed and commits suicide by throwing herself in a well Will the lover be responsible for this suicide of the pros ? How can a person who has taken the Vow of *Brahmacharyya* for betterment of his soul be held responsible for death If he is not sinful, how is a person virtuous because of the saving of the tree or the wealth of somebody ? To abstain from sin is in itself virtuous Religion does not depend on what happens to other beings—whether others are benifitted or harmed It depends on how far a person is harmless in his own conduct and behaviour There are many violent acts where there is no death involved But a votary of *Ahimsa* has to give up all such acts even though apparently no death occurs e g acts of mental violence "

How far an Ahimsak is benefactor

I have already said at one place that a violent person injures himself through self It has been said in Jain Scriptures that even a cut-throat enemy does not do that harm which a wicked person does to himself by his wickedness As *Himsa* is harmful in itself so *Ahimsa* is a virtue in itself It is self benevolence A person who becomes a votary of *Ahimsa* benefits himself most It is a mere vanity on the part of a votary of *Ahimsa* to claim that he is a protector or benefactor of others It is not in his power to benefit or protect others If he is instrumental in such acts it is by the dictates of the fate of others and an *Ahimsak* cannot take pride in the same He cannot claim any credit for it As *Jivas* die of their own Karmas so also they live or are protected by their own A third person cannot do or undo their fate One can simply refrain himself from vicious acts and whosoever does so saves his soul from being vitiated and is no more responsible for deaths occuring all round him

According to Jainism only that person is benefactor who saves his soul or the soul of others from sins To save one's soul from sins is self benevolence and to save others from sins is philanthropy A person who effects change in the heart of others by noble preachings and converts them to the cause of *Ahimsa* is certainly a great benefactor as he saves or rescues a habitual sinner He is the true saviour It has been very appropriately said —

सयम्मि वि जियलोए, तेण इहं घोसिओ अमाघाओ
इक्कंपि जो दुहत्तं, सत्तं बोहइ जिणवयणे

"A person who converts a single unhappy person to the preachings of *Lord Jina*, causes a proclamation of non-injury to be announced throughout the three worlds"

Saint Bhicanji has rightly said "There had been infinite Arihants in times past who practised and preached the law of *Ahimsa* They could benefit only those who heard and embraced the idea of *Ahimsa* at their feet They could not do any benefit to other creatures of all the six kinds who may be said to have been survived only to reap the fruits of their own actions *Jivas* live infinitely Death is only a change of form *Jivas* pass through transmigrations and reap the fruits of their own actions Life is not at all valuable if it is not for the observance of religion Protection is of no value if it means only continuance of a sinful life *Saints* and *seers* never try to protect or help the protection of sinful lives

Jainism says that right knowledge, right faith, right conduct and right austerities—these four form the path of Liberation Whoever preaches the noble four-fold path is a true benefactor A person who is taught these paths is also benefited as his soul is ennobled There is no other person or being who may be said to be protected *Lord Nemi Nath* gave up the idea of marriage with *Rajimati* The animals brought for marriage feast were saved *Lord Nemi Nath* saved himself from the sin to which he would have been a party had he consented to marriage but what good may he said to have done towards the goats that were saved? They remained to be killed by somebody else He thought of his self and self alone when he uttered "the killing of these screaming beings for marriage feast will not be for the benifit of my soul"

जइ मज्झ कारणा एए हम्मंति सुबहू जिया।
न मे एयं तु निस्सेसं परलोगे भविस्सइ॥

War and Ahimsa

War and *Ahimsa* are conflicting things Where there is war there is no *Ahimsa* and where there is *Ahimsa* there can be no war As war is an annihilation or negation of *Ahimsa* it is never blissful or meritorious much less commendable Jainism has always and as a matter of principle abhored war There may have been a great number of instances where Jain laymen took part in wars or were themselves the sponsors thereof but they never treated wars as religious but took their act as ultimately harmful to the cause of the Soul To take part in war has been for them a matter of deep atonement

Lord Rishava, was the first religious preacher or *Tirthankara* of the Jains He had one hundred sons The eldest was *Bharat* *Lord Rishava* before he initiated himself into the holy order of ascetics distributed his kingdom amongst his 100 sons Afterwards *Bharat* aspired to conquer all the six parts of the world and asked his brothers to obey his sway and to hand over to him their part of the kingdom *Bahubali* refused to do so and so also the remaining 98 brothers However the 98 brothers went to pay homage to *Lord Rishava* and by the by talked to him about the great injustice that *Bharat* was going to perpetuate against them all *Lord Rishava* said 'This wealth and kingdom is transient The entire earth with all its wealth is not sufficient to quench the thirst of greed Attachment is also as great a sin as greed Do not bear any attachment to your

wealth and kingdom Give up them all voluntarily and surrender your souls to yourselves Do not allow yourselves to be conquered by others, for the sake of wealth and property The ninety-eight sons of *Rishava* were convinced of the truth and become initiated into the holy order leaving all their wealth and property behind A great war was averted by the non-violent preachings of *Lord Rishava* Attachment and hatred are the two great causes of war To be patriotic to one's own nation or country to the extent of exclusion of all considerations for other nations or countries is attachment and to be indifferent to the rights or welfare of other nations or countries in aversion or hatred To think always of self aggrandisement at the cost of others or to exploit others for the sake of one's upliftment is the root cause of all wars *Tirthankars* have always preached for the eradication of these two great evils They have always preached "keep aloof from attachment and hatred'

Nemi was a Kshatriya Prince of *Mithila* He renounced his kingdom and wanted to take to holy order At that time a Brahmin approached him and said "Oh King ! You are a Kshatriya Prince Show your mettle first You should first conquer the kings—who are still unsubjugated and then only should you think of initiation' *Nemi* replied

जो सहस्सं सहस्साण संगामे दुज्जए जिणे
एगं जिणेज्ज अप्पाणं एस से परमो जओ

"Greater is the victory of him, who conquers his only Soul than of him who conquers thousands of valient foes in a fierce battle"

अप्पाणमेव जुज्झाहि किं ते जुज्झेण बज्झओ
अप्पाणमेव अप्पाण जइत्ता सुह मेहए

"Fight with thy own self What is the use of fighting with external foes? Be happy by conquering thy soul thyself"

From what has been said above, it is apparent that Jainism has regarded the conquering of passions as one of the most fierce battle and the success in such battle as the supreme victory It has always denounced external war कि ते जुज्झेण बज्झओ—'Of what avail is to fight externally'—has been repeated so many times in *Jain* Scriptures

Lord Mahavira was the 24th *Thirthankara* or the last religious preacher possessing the supreme knowledge and flourished about three thousand years back He was the greatest votary of *Ahimsa* of his time and is still unsurpassed as an uncompromising champion of *Ahimsa* He has said in one of his discourses

कोहो पीइ पणासेइ माणो विणय नासओ
माया मित्ताणि नासेइ लोभा सव्व विणासणो

"Anger destroys the cordial relations pride destroys humility, deceit destroys friendship and greed destroys everything"

No one can doubt that anger or feelings of wrath and condemnation, pride or false sense of prestige, deceit or mutual betrayal of trust, and greed or insatiable desire for self aggrandisement have brought about the colossal destruction under which the present world is so helplessly groaning

Lord Mahavira has further said

उवसमेण हणे कोहं, माणं मद्दवया जिणे
मायमज्जवभावेण लोभं संतोसओ जिणे

"Conquer anger by quietness pride by humility, deceit by simplicity and greed by contenment"

Calmness, contentment, humility and simplicity are the four great virtues and there is no doubt that a nation wide culture of the same would lead to universal brotherhood and permanent peace of the world

Jainism has always said that war cannot lead to peace It can only lead to war Enemity can not be calmed down by enemity in return Fire cannot extinguish fire Enemity can only be pacified by virtue of *Ahimsa*

In *Gita*, *Lord Krishna* said to *Arjuna* "in case you will fall in battle field you would attain heaven" Thus saying *Krishna* exhorted *Arjuna* to fight

हतो वा प्राप्स्यसि स्वर्गं जित्वा वा भोक्ष्यसे महीम्
तस्मादुत्तिष्ठ कौन्तेय युद्धाय कृतनिश्चय

A contrast to the above suggestion of *Lord Krishna* is found in *Bhagwati Sutra* of the Jains Once *Gotama*, the foremost desciple of *Lord Mahavira* asked him—"Many people say that those who are killed in battle field attain heaven—how far is this true ? *Lord Mahavira* replied that, it was not true and than explained how people came to utter this He said "In Vaisali there was a person named *Varuna* who was the grandson of *Nag* He was a layman devotee of great affluence and used to fast every third day

When the *Ratham ushal* war broke out he was forced to join the battle under the order of the king and his cabinet. He prolonged his fasting period before joining the battle in obedience of the aforesaid order. When he sat in his chariot, he took the following vow: "I will strike only the person who strikes me first. I will not strike or kill others." After going to the battle field he was confronted with a strong warrior but he remained firm and did not kill him so long as he was not attacked first. In this way *Varuna* was severely wounded and at last when death seemed to draw near he retired to loneliness, took his seat in a solitary bed of dried *kusha* grass and facing himself towards the east, uttered the following salutation.

"Obeisance to the *Arihantas*, obeisance to the Liberated ones, obeisance to religious preceptors, obeisance to the religious heads and obeisance to all the *Sadhus*. I offer my humble respect from this place to the *Lord*. May he accept my humble respect from this place. Since long I was placed only in five gross vows. Now I take to life-long great vows." Having said this he put off his armour, quilt and arrows and died peacefully after attoning for his sins.

A friend of *Varuna* was also with him in the battle field. When he saw the wounded *Varuna* returning from the battle field he also followed suit and said—"whatever vows my friend *Varuna* has embraced the same are also to me." In this way both the friends courted the death very calmly.

When gods saw that *Varuna* and his friend were dead they sprinkled scented water over their dead bodies and also showered flowers of five colours. The gods celebrated

the occasion with songs and music People there saw this all and began to say 'Those who are wounded or killed on the battle field are born as celestial beings or *Devas*' But Gautama! this is not the correct inference The truth is that *Varuna* and his friend were born in heaven on account of their reluctance to participate in the war, and their vigilance to abstain from violence and cruelty to the extent possible even when forced to join it They did not attain heaven on account of their death on the battle-field but on account of their inner abhorrence to cruelty in war"

Ahimsa as a mass religion

Ahimsa is understood to be an unpractical religion It is regarded as something which cannot be implanted or grown in human hearts Violence is the law of nature—the stronger living on the weaker—is the universal law This universal law cannot be replaced by any other order without grave danger to security of human life and property *Ahimsa* can never be a universal religion This is the general notion which has taken the shape more or less of a strong superstition unsurmountable even by men of strong reasonings *Lord Mahavira* has on the other hand called it the eternal law He has named it the religion of all *Ahimsa* is capable of being made a universal religion by its intrinsic merit Even modern thinkers say "It is the weapon of the bravest, and what is more, it is the bravery of spirit that is the requisite thing Thus it permits everyone, man, woman and child, the strong as well as the weak in body, to avail of it, provided one is stout-hearted and firm of faith and devoid of fear" Wish is the father of the thought It is our devotion to violence and lack of inner urge to eradicate it that [illegible] believe *Ahimsa* as

unpractical precept People have become akin and addicted to life of violence to such an extent that they think it impossible to convert themselves to the concept of *Ahimsa* Dr Katzu has rightly remarked "Violence has stolen a long march during thousand of years There are so many miscon ceptions to be removed Non-Violence is unintelligible to so many To some it is a counsel of perfection, fit for *rishis* only To others it is stupid, there is seemingly such a child like faith in violence"

People have become totally blind to stern realities of life and its value They have forgotten to contemplate on the real welfare of the soul and are thus deprived of the great inspiration to noble life which such contemplation offers It has been truly said "It is necessary to revise some of our prevailing notions about civilisation and happiness There is a direct relation between an ease-loving life and violence Deeds of colossal magnitude and pomp, and a life of dazzling prosperity and luxury cannot be raised and maintained without violence It is a mistake to regard these as marks of civilisation"

The present structure of society puts a definite premium on violence, in the circumstances, how can *Ahimsa* be made a religion of the masses? The solution is simple but strenuous It depends on right kind of training and discipline and our zeal to put forth incessant endeavours to educate the masses on proper lines Our ways of life have got to be remodelled the outlook of life has got to be radically changed The present theory of relative value which assigns to materialism a higher place than spiritualism has got to be recasted Religion and morality are to be assigned their right place in the hearts of humanity This

is possible only by completely overhauling the present system of education, nay by replacing the same by a system which would create pious hearts not intelligent minds only, which would teach men nobler qualities of heart and purify their inner feelings and not only sharpen the intellect, which may not produce good engineers, doctors, aviators or barristers, etc, but which would produce men of pure character and pious hearts Once this is done, *Ahimsa* will have its right place in the hearts of men It will begin to appear them to be the only natural course of life Dr Katzu has rightly remarked

"I personally think that the ideal of non violence is not unrealizable On the contrary, I think that it can be reached, and that humanity, after the experience of the horrors of two world wars in the course of a quarter of a century, will willingly strive after it But to attain that goal we shall have to educate public opinion in its favour, more particularly by radically planning the whole field of education on the basis of non violence We must begin with the child and mould the mind of the coming generation accordingly "

To make *Ahimsa* a religion of the masses, strenuous efforts should be made to remove the misconceptions about it Right visions are to be implanted in very heart by right kind of education Young minds must be trained up on the ideology of *Ahimsa* Jainism prescribes many important rules of discipline and mental training for a person who aspires to be non-violent A universal adoption of these basic precepts will go a long way in creating mental atmosphere for the growth of a non violent life We summerize these teachings in brief here

(1) All lives are as sacred as the human life Killing of other lives is as sinful as the killing of the human life

(2) All souls are in essence the same The distinction of body, sense organs knowledge, race, colour, country, etc, is superficial and has no justification for partial treatment

(3) Attachment is as bad as hatred and contempt Impartiality is the real virtue

(4) Death is no calamity but a natural event It is not extinction but re birth according to one's own action It is not a termination but a fresh lease of life

(5) There is no external enemy The soul is its own friend or enemy By its good actions, it is its friend By its bad actions, it is its enemy

(6) Death is the dictate of one's own fate and not the deed of others

(7) Religion is the highest bliss It consists in *Ahimsa*, self restraint and penance

(8) Religion is precious than life itself A life which is sacrificed at the alter of religion is always purified and ennobled

(9) Material prosperity is no prosperity Wealth, power and all kinds of material possessions are detrimental to the real happiness of the soul

(10) Sense-pleasures are painful in the long run like the *Kimpak* fruit which is sweet in taste only but poisonous in effect

(11) As you saw so you reap Sin always follows the sinner ' It never looks to the motive of the person but to his actions Whatever may be the purpose and whoever the person for whom a sin is committed the doer alone is responsible Bad actions have always bad fruits and good actions always good

(19) Human life is the most precious of all lives and most difficult to obtain The summum bonum of human life is the culture of religion This should not be trifled away

The above ideology is essential for the growth of a right frame of mind As a seed cannot bear fruit in barren land so also the principle of *Ahimsa* cannot grow and flourish on a rock bed of outlook based on violence

Besides training the young generati n on the ideology of non-violence, a living faith in the ideal of *Ahimsa* should be created by other means as well *Lord Mahavira* wanted to spread the ideal of *Ahimsa* He had to devote his entire life for its sake All his sermons are full of great devotion towards the cause of *Ahimsa* And he gave not only valuable ethical sermons for mental discipline but gave charming stories and fascinating fictions to educate the people in the ways of this virtue He lived to instil and inspire a feeling of deep rooted respect for non-violence and non-violent life and aroused a feeling of deep indignation towards violence of all sorts It was by this steady and all round process of working within and bringing about the mental change that he could achieve wonderful success in his mission Not only the ordinary folk but warriors of great fame and kings and

emperors of great prowess fell on his feet and became devotees to the cause of *Ahimsa*. Great dacoits, murderers and bloody warriors were converted into staunch advocates of *Ahimsa* and their expiation for their past cruelties were exemplary.

It was the firm faith and deep conviction of *Lord Mahavira* which wrought such miracles. The miracle of making *Ahimsa* a mass religion is capable of being achieved even to day provided those who have faith in it, endeavour unceasingly to infuse the same in others. People are living *in an age of great scientific upheavel, which has made them* all the more sceptical. Superstitions born of growing materialism are looming large in the mental Horizon. In the circumstances those who profess *Ahimsa* as religion have to bear the torch in the midst of heavy storms. They must perform their task with Herculean strength. They must unceasingly endeavour by precept and example to create a living faith in *Ahimsa*.

A brief sketch of the means to be harnessed for the propagation of the ideal of *Ahimsa* to make it a mass religion would be as follows :—

1. A sense of highest chivalry and pride in deeds of *Ahimsa* should be inculcated. This can be awakened and developed through devotional literature on *Ahimsa*. The educationists, the authors, philosophers, poets and historians all should be encouraged to bring forth inspiring literature on the subject. The screen the platform, the schools and the colleges—all must be directed by a common policy of educating the people on the lines of non violence.

2 To re-model the social festivals, customs, etiquettes and manners so as to base the same on the principle of *Ahimsa*

3 To bring into light the lives and achievements of all great saints and apostles of *Ahimsa* and to start re-search work on their achievements

4 To set apart a particular day in a year as a day of complete cessation from all worldly activities and observance of complete fasting, prayer, meditation and expiation of sins Jains observe such a day on *Bhadra Sudi* 4th or 5th as the case may be It is called *Samvatsari* or the best day of the year All have to observe fast and devote themselves to prayer with observance of celibacy All have to recapitulate the sins committed during the year and beseech for forgiveness with all humbleness and purity of heart The spirit of the observance of this day will be best understood by reading the following couplets

सव्वस्स जीवरासिस्स भावओ धम्मनिहिअनिअचित्तो।
सव्वे खमावइत्ता खमामि सव्वस्स अहयं पि॥
खामेमि सव्वे जीवे सव्वे जीवा खमंतु मे।
मित्ती मे सव्वभूएसु वेरं मज्झ न केणइ॥
जं जं मणेण बद्धं जं जं वायाए भासियं पावं।
जं जं काएण कयं मिच्छा मि दुक्कडं तस्स॥

"With feelings of devotion towards religion and with all internal piety, I beseech forgiveness of all living beings for the sins I have committed towards them I on my turn also forgive them"

'I beseech forgiveness of all Let all beings f me I have amity towards all and enmity towards no l

"Whatever sins I may have indulged in ment whatever misdeeds I may have done by words of mouth whatever sins I may have bodily committed—let all my prove futile—I repent and atone for all"

5 State policy must be directed on principles *Ahimsa* Dr Katzu suggests —

'The conclusion, in my view, is that in our present environment non violence can only succeed as a creed and nothing else Just as Soviet Russia made deliberate attempt to alter the whole structure of society and modify all the current and accepted notions of human nature by conscious state effort, similarly those who believe in non violence and non-cooperation as the future hope of humanity must acquire power in body politic in non violent ways, and then endeavour to make non violence the only essential instrument of our national policy '

— o —